

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
	10/084,567	(02/27/2002	Yanchun Zhao		CA920010020US1 7960		
	25259	7590	03/02/2006			EXAMINER		
	IBM CORPORATION					PATEL, NIRAV B		
	3039 CORN	3039 CORNWALLIS RD.						
	DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195					ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				27700		2135		

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		ϵ	· /					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
Advisory Action	10/084,567	ZHAO ET AL.						
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Nirav Patel	2135						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 February 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.						
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:								
	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In							
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee								
nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS								
	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecause					
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 								
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			(
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.								
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <i>None</i> .								
Claim(s) objected to: <i>None</i> .								
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,4-6,8-15 and 18-20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>None</u> .								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and								
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).								
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attact	hed.					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:					
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)						

Application No.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed February 9, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments for claims 1, 5, and 13, the recitation "the message including information for constructing a query to access data of the server" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See In re Hirao, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and Kropa v. Robie, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Applicant argues that:

"Applicants respectfully submit that Tarbotton also fails to teach the message types of the claimed invention. Tarbotton does not teach or suggest that the email itself is examined for message types and that its scan for unwanted properties makes a determination in relation to the message type for the email message".

Examiner still maintains that, Tarbotton teaches the message type of the claimed invention [col. 4 lines 46-48 "receive an e-mail message having associated one or more e-mail message characteristics" Flg. 5, col. 6 lines 22-25]. Tarbotton teaches that email itself is examined for message types and that its scan for unwanted properties makes a determination in relation to the message type for the email message [Fig. 2, col. 5 lines 60-65, col. 6 lines 4-7].

For the above reasons, it is belived that the rejections should be sustained.

Note: With regards to newly added claims 21-23, would raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or thorough search.

KIM VU SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100